

Remarks

I: INTRODUCTION

Claims 20-22 have been added. Claims 11 and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11, 14 and 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 11, 14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,224,011 to Yalla et al. (the "Yalla patent"). It is respectfully submitted that none of claims 11, 14 and 19 is anticipated by the Yalla patent, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 19 recites, inter alia, the following:

wherein the LCD elements include a
different respective LCD element for each
of the tripping parameters to be adjusted

As regards Applicants recited "LCD elements," the Examiner apparently relies on Fig. 11b, 12c and d, 13 and 14. In particular, the Examiner asserts that "[Yalla] further discloses the display including the LCD element for each of the tripping parameters (see Fig. 11b, 12c and d, 13, 14), wherein each of the tripping parameters is represented by its own element." Respectfully, only a single display is disclosed in the Yalla patent. The figures upon which the Examiner relies show parameters displayed sequentially on the same display. These figures do not show each of the tripping parameters represented by its own element, as asserted by the Examiner, and also do not show "wherein the LCD elements include a different respective LCD element for each of the tripping parameters to be adjusted," as recited in claim 19. Thus, for example, simultaneous display of parameters is not possible in the device described in the Yalla patent. For at least this reason, the Yalla patent does not anticipate claim 19.

Claims 11 and 14 depend from claim 19. Accordingly,

for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with claim 19, the Yalla patent does not anticipate claims 11 and 14.

In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claims 11, 14 and 19 should be withdrawn.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIM 12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over the Yalla patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,543 to Dvorak et al. (the "Dvorak patent"). It is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is not obvious over the Dvorak patent, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 12 depends from claim 19. Accordingly, the arguments presented above in connection with claim 19 and the Yalla patent apply equally to claim 12. The Dvorak patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Yalla patent. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 13, 15 AND 16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over the Yalla patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,038,246 to Durivage, III (the "Durivage patent"). It is respectfully submitted that none of claims 13, 15 and 17 is obvious over the Yalla patent in view of the Durivage patent, for at least the following reasons.

Claims 13, 15 and 16 depend from claim 19. Thus, the arguments presented above in connection with claim 19 and the Yalla patent apply equally to claims 13, 15 and 16. The Durivage patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Yalla patent. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 13, 15 and 17 should be withdrawn.

V. REJECTION OF CLAIM 17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over the Yalla patent, in view of the Durivage

patent, and in further view of *In re Stevens*. It is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is not obvious over the Yalla patent, in view of the Durivage patent and in further view of *In re Stevens*, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 17 depends from claim 19. Thus, the arguments presented above in connection with claim 19 apply equally to claim 17. The Durivage patent and *In re Stevens* do not cure the deficiencies of the Yalla patent. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

VI. REJECTION OF CLAIM 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over the Yalla patent in view of an LCD element from Kent. It is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is not obvious over the Yalla patent and the LCD element from Kent, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 18 depends from claim 19. Thus the arguments presented above in connection with claim 19 and the Yalla patent apply equally to claim 18. The LCD from Kent does not cure the deficiencies of the Yalla patent. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

VII. IDS

Applicants note that Applicants have not received copy of the initialed PTO Form 1449, which was filed in connection with the IDS of September 13, 2000, and resubmitted on September 10, 2003. The Office Action Summary indicates that a PTO-1449 is attached to the present Office Action; however, no such PTO-1449 was attached. It is requested that the Examiner provide Applicants with a copy of the initialed PTO-1449 with the next communication.

VIII. CLAIMS 20-22

Claims 20-22 have been added. Support for these new claims can be found throughout the specification. It is respectfully submitted that claims 20-22 are allowable over

the cited prior art.

IX. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims 11-22 are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Ray L. Mayer (N 360812)

Dated: 25 May 2004

By: *RM*

Richard L. Mayer
(Reg. No. 22,490)

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
Customer No. 26646